Applicants are canceling claims 1-39 and adding new claims 40-79 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 101

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 30 under 35 USC §101, Paragraph 1, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed subject matter fails to provide a useful, tangible result. In the interests of advancing prosecution, newly presented independent claims 40, 57 and 69 are discussed in view of the Examiner's rejection below.

Newly presented claims 40 and 57 respectively recite a method and computer program code containing elements for "*identifying a plurality of events responsive to monitoring user input to a client device*" and "*updating a display of search results responsive to receiving the plurality of search results*". The plurality of events identified responsive to monitoring user input to a client device represent real-world events such as physical interaction between the user and client device. Updating a display of the search results provides a useful, concrete and tangible result based on the user input. Based on the remarks above, Applicants submit independent claims 40 and 57 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Newly presented independent claim 69 recites a computer system of software components for performing the elements discussed above. Applicants submit that claim 69 is directed to statutory subject matter, for the same reasons as claims 40 and 57. Claims 41-56, 58-68, and 70-79 either directly or indirectly depend from claims 40, 57 and 69. Thus, Applicants submit claims 41-56, 58-68, and 70-79 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 1

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 30 under 35 USC §112, Paragraph 1, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use this invention. In the interests of advancing prosecution, newly presented independent claims 40, 57 and 69 are discussed in view of the Examiner's rejection below.

In his rejection, the Examiner asserts that the "user-context attribute" constitutes subject matter not defined in the specification. User context attributes are defined in paragraph [0033] of the Applicants specification, "*The user context attribute is intended to be broadly defined herein and generally is an attribute that is associated with some aspect or the user's current interaction with a user interface or client computer*". Examples of user-context attributes are given, for example in paragraphs [0033] and [0034] of the Applicants specification.

In his rejection, the Examiner asserts that the relationship between the "input signal" and "user-context attribute" is unclear. Newly presented claims 40 and 57 recite a method and program code for:

> identifying a plurality of events responsive to monitoring user input to a client device
> identifying a plurality of user-context attributes based at least in part on the plurality of events;
> generating a plurality of search queries comprised of terms, wherein the terms are based at least in part on the plurality of user-context attributes;

In these elements, a plurality of events are identified responsive to monitoring user input to a client device. A plurality of user-context attributes is identified based at least in part on the plurality of events. Accordingly, the user-context attribute is based at least in part on the plurality of events, which are based at least in part on the user input. Additional disclosure of this relationship is found, for example, in paragraphs [0042] and [0043] of the Applicants specification.

The Examiner further asserts that the relationship between user-context attributes and search queries is unclear. Newly presented claims 40 and 57 recite "search queries comprised of terms, wherein the terms are based at least in part on the plurality of user-context attributes", thus clarifying this relationship.

Based on the remarks above, Applicants submit that independent claims 40 and 57 comply with the enablement requirement. Newly presented independent claim 69 recites a computer system of software components for performing the elements discussed above. Applicants submit that claim 69 complies with the enablement requirement, for the same reasons as claims 40 and 57. Claims 41-56, 58-68, and 70-79 either directly or indirectly depend from claims 40, 57 and 69. Thus, Applicants submit claims 41-56, 58-68, and 70-79 are directed to statutory subject matter

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 40-79 form the basis of statutory subject matter and comply with the enablement requirement.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: __April 12, 2007__   By: _____/Brian Hoffman/_____

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350